

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

RAUL SOLIS, III, ET AL.,

**Plaintiffs,**

**V.**

**CRESCENT DRILLING AND  
PRODUCTION, INC., and CRESCENT  
DRILLING FOREMAN, INC.,**

## Defendants.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. SA-19-CA-1194-FB**

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court are the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 254) concerning Defendants' Amended Bill of Costs (docket no. 247-1), Defendants' written objections (docket no. 255) thereto, Plaintiffs' response (docket no. 256) to Defendants' written objections, and Defendant's reply (docket no. 257) to Plaintiff's response.

Where no party has objected to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of the Report and Recommendation. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made."). In such cases, the Court need only review the Report and Recommendation and determine whether it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989).

On the other hand, any Report and Recommendation to which objection is made requires de novo review by the Court. Such a review means that the Court will examine the entire record, and will make an independent assessment of the law. The Court need not, however, conduct a de novo review


when the objections are frivolous, conclusive, or general in nature. *Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

The Court has thoroughly analyzed the parties' submissions in light of the entire record. As required by Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), the Court has conducted an independent review of the entire record in this cause and has conducted a de novo review with respect to those matters raised by the objections. After due consideration, the Court concludes Defendants' objections lack merit.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (docket no. 254) concerning Defendants' Amended Bill of Costs (docket no. 247-1) is ACCEPTED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) such that Defendants' request for costs associated with original deposition transcripts and deposition exhibits for the witnesses deposed in this case is GRANTED but Defendant's requests for costs associated with the video recording of depositions, initial costs related to depositions, costs of court proceeding transcripts, pro hac vice fees, private process server fees, costs of obtaining copies of tax returns and postage fees are DENIED.

It is so ORDERED.

SIGNED this 15th day of December, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
FRED BIERY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE